REMARKS

Claims 1-29 were pending in the Office Action. Upon entry of the present paper, claims 4-12, 14-15 and 18 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer; claims 1, 13 and 20 are amended; and new claims 30-34 are added. No new matter is introduced herein, as support for the amendments may be found, among other places, at pages 65-66 of the specification (paragraphs [0231-0235]).

In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 5-6, 8, 9-10, 12 and 20, 22-25 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Peck et al. (2003/0038842); while claims 4, 7, 11, 13-19, 21, 26-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peck et al. in view of Applicants' choice of various features. Applicants address these rejections below.

Independent Claim 1 and Dependent Claims 2-3 and 30-34

Amended independent claim 1 recites, among other features, "storing a library of iconic representations of image detection solution fragments in a memory, said solution fragments corresponding to different image components." The cited reference, Peck et al., fails to teach or suggest such image detection solution fragments that "correspond to different image components." Peck et al. relates generally to the use of a graphical program to generate a measurement function, such as signal conditioning, analysis and display. See, e.g., para. [0013]. Peck et al. includes a general reference to a "machine vision function" (see para. [0134]), but does not discuss this function in much detail, and fails to teach or suggest the recited image detection solution fragments corresponding to different image components, and the associated recited method that uses these fragments.

For at least these reasons, amended independent claim 1 distinguishes over the cited references. Claims 2-3 and 30-34 depend from claim 1, and are distinguishable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, and further in view of the various features recited therein. For example, new claim 30 recites "visually highlighting a detected image component in said input image," while claim 31 recites "sending an event trigger signal when a combination of at least two image components is detected in said input image." Claim 32 further recites that "said event trigger signal is sent based on a proximity between said at least two image components." Peck et al., which does not elaborate on its "machine vision," fails to teach or suggest basing any event trigger on a proximity between the at least two image components, as recited in claim 32.

Independent Claim 13 and Dependent Claims 16-17 and 19

Applicants have amended claim 13 to recite language previously recited in claims 14 and 15 (which have been canceled herein). Those claims, and others, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over what appears to be a combination of Peck et al. and Applicants' own disclosure. Specifically, the Office Action refers to "applicants' choice" of "merely" using certain listed features. To the extent this was intended, Applicants submit that Applicants' own disclosure cannot qualify as prior art for a combination under section 103, and that the rejection must be withdrawn. To the extent the Office Action alleges that the listed features were well-known in the art, Applicants request identification (pursuant to MPEP 2144.03(C)) of the art that forms the basis for such an allegation. For example, Applicants request an identification of the art that allegedly shows synchronously passing input to a reconfigurable hardware platform at a frequency based on a complexity of the solution, with the limiting frequency of the most complex solution currently loaded in the hardware. The only

identified art, Peck et al., certainly does not mention a frequency at which input data is passed. If any such art is identified in a rejection in a subsequent Office Action, Applicants request that the Office Action not be made final, so that Applicants can have a fair opportunity to respond to that art.

For at least these reasons, claim 13 distinguishes over the cited prior art. Claims 16-17 and 19 depend from claim 13, and are distinguishable for at least the same reasons as claim 13, and further in view of the features recited therein.

Independent Claim 20 and Dependent Claims 21-29

Amended independent claim 20 recites, among other features, "said icons corresponding to instructions for detecting the presence of a plurality of image objects in an input image." As noted above, Peck et al. does not provide much detail on its "machine vision," and accordingly, fails to teach or suggest icons corresponding to instructions for detecting the presence of a plurality of image objects in an input image." Furthermore, amended claim 20 recites "behavioral code used to configure a target platform to detect the presence of said plurality of image objects in an input image, and to issue an indication based on a proximity of said detected image objects." Peck et al. does not teach or suggest detecting such a presence of a plurality of image objects in an input image, and does not teach or suggest issuing an indicating based on a proximity of the detected image objects.

For at least these reasons, claim 20 distinguishes over the cited prior art. Claims 21-29 depend from claim 20, and are distinguishable for at least the same reasons as claim 20, and further in view of the features recited therein.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that pending claims 1-3, 13, 16-17 and 19-34 are distinguishable over the cited references, and are in condition for allowance. However, if the Examiner feels that additional discussion and/or amendment would be helpful, the Examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' undersigned representative at the number appearing below.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: April 5, 2007

By: /Steve Chang/
Steve S. Chang
Registration No. 42,402

Banner & Witcoff, Ltd.
1100 13th St. N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597

Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001